

Appl. No. : **09/683,600**
Filed : **January 24, 2002**

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above referenced application are respectfully requested.

The Examiner is thanked for the Interview that was conducted on April 9th 2008, The interpretation of claim language taken by the Examiner was discussed during the interview, specifically that claim language was broad enough to cover more than just the voice recognition results being returned.

In response, and as discussed during the interview, claim 13 is amended herewith to recite a document that is returned includes text that represents the voice being recognized.

Claim 19 is amended to recite voice recognized text in a document.

Claim 24 is maintained, since it already defined that the information in the document is "displayed as words that represents the voice data". As amended, this should obviate the interpretation set forth below. The previous rejections are obviated for similar reasons to those previously discussed.

Claims 13-15, 17 and 24 stands rejected under 35 USC 102 as allegedly being unpatentable over Perro. This has been obviated by the claim language.

Specifically, Perro teaches a system which allows language queries to be sent to a remote device, and used in that remote device for carrying out searches. For example, a user of Perro's system might say words that are taken as a natural

Appl. No. : **09/683,600**
Filed : **January 24, 2002**

language search. Those words may be voice recognized in the remote device. Based on the voice recognized words, a database, or Web directory, or some other resource accessible by the remote device may be searched. See for example paragraph 45 of Perro. Another embodiment of Perro may use a portable telephone, where the user can speak into the portable telephone, and voice-recognition software 23 on the server interprets the query spoken into the phone, and then carries out the search on the server.

However, the present claims are directed to a wholly different concept, that is itself unobvious based on the prior art and is based on a problem that was not recognized or evident from the prior art. Specifically, claim 13 recognizes the problem that thin computers may have difficulties in carrying out voice-recognition. For example, one may want to carry out a voice-recognition application with a personal digital assistant. However, the PDA device may not have sufficient resources to do the best job at voice recognition. According to claim 13, therefore, the voice-is sent to another computer, the voice is recognized, and text that represents the results of the recognizing is returned to the original device. Emphasis has been added, since that latter operation is not carried out by Perro.

This is a wholly different than anything suggested by Perro. Perro suggests getting a voice on a device, e.g. a phone (Figure 2), and sending that voice to a remote computer and carrying out voice-recognition on that remote computer. However, Perro also defines using those results on the remote computer, not sending them back to the original computer. In other words, the voice-recognition may be carried out on a server, and then those results are used to search some database on the server. Perro voice

Appl. No. : **09/683,600**
Filed : **January 24, 2002**

recognizes remotely, and then uses the results remotely. Perro does not voice recognize and then send back those results.

Claim 13 should therefore be allowable along with the claims that depend therefrom.

Claim 17 is amended to recite that the recognition results are displayed on the first computer and includes words that represent the spoken voice. This is further distinct from the prior art that does not display such information, does not return words that represent the spoken voice, as claimed.

Claim 19 has been amended in a similar way, and should be allowable for analogous reasons.

Claim 25 (which was rejected as being obvious over Perro) depends from claim 24 and should be allowable for analogous reasons to those discussed above. In addition, however, claim 25 defines that the connection capability, that connects to send the voice data to be recognized, is a Bluetooth part. While the prior art does teach use of Bluetooth for communication, it does not teach or suggest or motivate a person having ordinary skill in the art to use of Bluetooth part for the purpose of sending information to be recognized, as claimed.

Claim 18 was rejected over Perro in view of Edson. This claim should be allowable by virtue of its dependency for reasons discussed above.

Claims 19-23 stand rejected over Edson in view of Perro. Claim 19 has been amended in an analogous way to recite that the recognition information is returned in a document that represents the spoken voice. As described above, nothing in the cited

Appl. No. : **09/683,600**
Filed : **January 24, 2002**

prior art teaches or suggests returning the voice recognized text to the original device that received and sent the voice in the first place.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

For all of these reasons, it is respectfully suggested that all of the claims should be in condition for allowance. A formal notice of allowance is hence respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that communications such as a telephone interview or email would facilitate disposal of this case, the undersigned respectfully encourages the Examiner to contact the undersigned.

Recognizing that Internet communications are not secure, I hereby authorize the USPTO to communicate with me concerning any subject matter of this application by electronic mail (using the email address scott@harrises.com). I understand that a copy of these communications will be made of record in the application file.

Please charge any fees due in connection with this response to Deposit Account No. 50-1387(small entity).

Appl. No. : **09/683,600**
Filed : **January 24, 2002**

Respectfully submitted,

Date: __ 4/9/2008

___/Scott C Harris/_____
Scott C. Harris
Reg. No. 32,030

Customer No. 23844
Scott C. Harris, Esq.
P.O. Box 927649
San Diego, CA 92192
Telephone: (619) 823-7778
Facsimile: (858) 756-7717